

The research program of the Center for Economic Studies (CES) produces a wide range of theoretical and empirical economic analyses that serve to improve the statistical programs of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Many of these analyses take the form of CES research papers. The papers are intended to make the results of CES research available to economists and other interested parties in order to encourage discussion and obtain suggestions for revision before publication. The papers are unofficial and have not undergone the review accorded official Census Bureau publications. The opinions and conclusions expressed in the papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Republication in whole or part must be cleared with the authors.

TECHNOLOGY USE AND WORKER OUTCOMES:

DIRECT EVIDENCE FROM LINKED EMPLOYEE-EMPLOYER DATA*

by

Adela Luque
University of California at Berkeley

and

Javier Miranda
American University

CES 00-13 August, 2000

All papers are screened to ensure that they do not disclose confidential information. Persons who wish to obtain a copy of the paper, submit comments about the paper, or obtain general information about the series should contact Sang V. Nguyen, Editor, Discussion Papers, Center for Economic Studies,

ABSTRACT

We investigate the impact of technology adoption on workers' wages and mobility in U.S. manufacturing plants by constructing and exploiting a unique Linked Employee-Employer data set containing longitudinal worker and plant information. We first examine the effect of technology use on wage determination, and find that technology adoption does not have a significant effect on high-skill workers, but negatively affects the earnings of low-skill workers after controlling for worker-plant fixed effects. This result seems to support the skill-biased technological change hypothesis. We next explore the impact of technology use on worker mobility, and find that mobility rates are higher in high-technology plants, and that high-skill workers are more mobile than their low and medium-skill counterparts. However, our technology-skill interaction term indicates that as the number of adopted technologies increases, the probability of exit of skilled workers decreases while that of unskilled workers increases.

Key Words: Technology Adoption, Linked Employee-Employer Data, Worker Mobility.

* This research was conducted at the Center for Economic Studies, U.S. Bureau of the Census in Washington, D.C.. The analyses and conclusions set forth in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the concurrence of the Bureau of the Census.

We are grateful to the staff of this Center, in particular, to C.J. Krizan and Tim Dunne for their comments and assistance. We wish to thank professor Julia Lane of American University for providing the demographic and wage data used in this study.

I. INTRODUCTION

What is the effect of technology adoption on worker mobility and wages? It is a well known and documented fact that the skill-level wage differential has widened in the last several decades. One of the hypothesis that has received more attention by economists is that the observed changes are likely the result of the introduction of skill biased technologies in the production process (Bound and Johnson (1992), Davis and Haltiwanger (1991), Sachs and Shatz (1994)). If new technologies and skilled labor are complements, then the implementation of new technologies in the workplace will increase the demand for skilled workers relative to unskilled workers, therefore increasing the relative wage of skilled workers.

A variety of studies have examined whether technological change in the U.S. is indeed technologically biased. Berndt, Morrison and Rosenblum (1992), Berman, Bound and Griliches (1994), and Autor, Katz and Krueger (1996) model changes in workforce skill as a function of changes in industry capital intensity and industry-level investment in computer equipment. All of them find evidence that capital and skill are complements and that there exists a positive correlation between changes in the skill of workers in an industry and the level of computer investment in the industry. Krueger (1993) uses cross-sectional worker data and finds that workers using computers are better paid than non-users. Dunne and Schmitz (1995), using plant-level data, show that workers employed in establishments that use more technologies are paid higher wages. On the other hand, in their longitudinal study Doms, Dunne and Troske (1997) find no correlation between technology adoption and worker wages, and conclude that most technologically advanced plants pay higher wages both pre and post the adoption of new technologies. In France, Entorf, Gollac and Kramarz (1997) examine the validity of the skill-biased technological change hypothesis using French longitudinal data on workers and firms. Similarly to Doms *et al.* (1997), they find that workers that

use computers were already better paid before working with computers, therefore concluding that the technology-wage “premium” is primarily the result of workers with higher unobserved abilities being more likely to use advanced technologies.

In this paper, we use a unique Linked Employee-Employer (LEE) data set containing longitudinal worker and plant information from 1985 to 1997 that allows us to estimate the effects of technology adoption, worker skill and the interaction of the two on the wages of individuals employed in manufacturing plants located in the State of Maryland. The present paper is the first study of this kind conducted with longitudinal U.S. data that brings together both worker and firm information. We construct a wage model in line with work by Abowd, Kramarz & Margolis (1999), Goux & Maurin (1995), Entorf, Gollac and Kramarz (1995) and Lane, Miranda, Spletzer & Burgess (1998) to control for both observed and unobserved worker and firm heterogeneity, and include a direct measure of plant technology use to investigate the interaction between technology and skill. The longitudinal information on both workers and firms allows us to both control for the impact of unobserved characteristics on both dimensions, and also to shed some light on the view that wage differentials between skill and unskilled workers in the U.S. is correlated with technological change.

Three different data sets are linked to construct the analytical file: Maryland’s Unemployment Insurance (UI) Records file, the Survey of Manufacturing Technology (SMT) and the Standard Statistical Establishment List (SSEL). The Unemployment Insurance Earnings Records contains quarterly earnings for all Maryland workers and is the source for constructed employer measures like employment, age, and churning. We link this longitudinal data for each worker to the Census administrative records to extract their demographic information like age, gender and race. A second link is made to the 1988 Survey of

Manufacturing Technology which provides cross sectional information on technology use of 17 different technologies in manufacturing plants. A final link is made to the SSEL to obtain a measure of longitudinal sales for the employers.

Our data presents us with a challenge. On the one hand, we have longitudinal information on observable time-varying individual and firm characteristics. However, our primary variables of interest (i.e., technology and skill level) are cross-sectional in nature.¹ If we are to exploit the longitudinal dimension of the data to obtain unbiased estimates of observable individual and firm characteristics (e.g., tenure, experience, plant size, plant age), we would proceed by using a within estimator to control for unobserved individual and plant fixed effects. Note, however, that estimation of fixed effects also removes the effect of our observed but cross-sectional variables of interest, and therefore, we would not be able to ascertain their effect on individuals' wages. To get around this problem, we follow a two-step estimation procedure.

In the first step, we exploit the longitudinal aspect of the data to estimate a wage equation employing a within individual-firm estimator to address omitted variable bias. In the second step, we turn to a cross-sectional analysis to exploit this other aspect of the data. The time-varying coefficients from step 1 are used to compute an estimated residual --the pure worker-firm wage plus a statistical error-- that is then averaged over time to produce an estimate of the joint worker-plant fixed effect. This estimate is then regressed on our measure of plant technology, worker skill and the interaction of the two in order to determine the effect of these factors on the average pure worker-firm wage. Estimates from this type of cross-sectional analysis

¹For all but eight manufacturing plants that had a link to the 1993 SMT. We will later make use of this longitudinal aspect.

suffer from omitted variable bias resulting from worker and firm unobservable characteristics, and may change once these aspects are controlled (Entorf, Gollac & Kramarz (1999)). To see how this may be affecting our results, we supplement the analysis with results from a longitudinal analysis on a subset of plants for which we have longitudinal technology information.

From the cross-sectional analysis, we find that plants with a higher number of technologies pay on average higher wages, that skilled workers earn higher wages than unskilled workers, and that the returns from a plant's technology use tend on average to accrue to the lower skill workers. These results are strikingly similar to results on French cross-sectional data by Entorf *et al.* (1999) as well as U.S. cross-sectional analysis in Doms *et al.* (1997) and Krueger (1993). Our longitudinal analysis, however, reveals that once we control for worker and firm unobservable characteristics, the interaction of skill with technology becomes not significant for high skilled workers, but unlike Entorf *et al.* (1999), is still significant, and in fact, reverses sign for low skilled workers. We find that low skilled workers earn less in more technologically advanced plants. The combined results are taken as evidence of skilled biased technological change in U.S. manufacturing firms. We consider that this result - which could not be captured in the French data - is reflective of the higher flexibility of wages in the U.S. versus the relative wage rigidity of wages in France. The wage adjustment we find for low skilled workers in technology adopting plants is consistent with findings by Doms *et al.* (1995) that technology adoption is not correlated with skill upgrading. The results also indicate the presence of selection of workers when firms allocate technology in manufacturing plants.

Selection, however, does not explain all the wage differentials we observe for unskilled workers across plants. The data suggest there are other stories at play in the economy. Groshen (1991) provides a

number of explanations for employer-based wage differentials while still maintaining a perfect competition model. These explanations range from unobserved characteristics of the workers and firms (sorting models), unobserved characteristics of the firms where they work (compensating differentials), imperfect information models, agency models and insider wages. Another possibility that plays directly into the technology-worker match is Sattinger's model of an assignment economy. Results from our longitudinal analysis, however, should be viewed with caution given the small number of plants in the longitudinal sample.

In addition to the effect that technology has on workers via the wage mechanism, does technology adoption affect worker mobility? This is the next question we address following Topel and Ward's (1992) empirical mobility model. We employ Cox's proportional hazard model to estimate the probability of a worker exiting a plant as a function of our measure of plant technology, individual skill level, worker wages and other observable individual and plant characteristics (e.g., gender, race, plant size). Our findings suggest that workers in more technologically advanced plants tend to be more mobile once we control for the effect of plant size. It also seems that high-skill workers have a higher probability of exiting the plant than their low-skill counterparts. On the other hand, and not too surprisingly, our technology-skill interaction indicates that high-skill workers employed in technologically advanced plants are less likely to exit, while we find the opposite for low-skill workers employed at these high-tech plants.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we describe the characteristics of this unique data set. Section III follows with a description of a model of wage determination that includes specific measures of technology and also the description of the two-step regression. Section IV presents the results from the two-step regression analysis, Section V introduces our longitudinal analysis and contrasts the

results from the two. In Section VI, we describe a model of mobility, and section VII presents our mobility estimation results. The last section summarizes our main conclusions.

II. DATA AND MEASUREMENT ISSUES

Given the uniqueness of the data set and the bearing it has on the type of analysis and estimation, we think it would be helpful to describe it at this point. Our longitudinal linked employer-employee data set is constructed from a variety of data sources. In particular, the Census administrative records, the Long Form of the 1990 Decennial Census, Maryland's Unemployment Insurance Records, the Survey of Manufacturing Technology for 1988 and 1993, and the Standard Statistical Establishment List are used to construct the two analytical data sets employed in the analysis.

1. Demographic Characteristics Data

Demographic characteristics of individual workers are obtained from the Census administrative records, and the 1990 Decennial Census. The Census administrative records provides information on race, age and gender of all workers in the State of Maryland. We then used the Long Form of the Decennial Census to obtain the education on a substantial subset of the Maryland workforce and use it to create predicted education categories for the remaining workforce. Since this variable is clearly measured with error, we collapse educational attainment into high, low and medium predicted education. These categories roughly correspond to 1) high school dropouts, 2) high school graduates and those with some college, and finally 3) college graduates. We refer to these categories as low, medium and high skill workers respectively.

2. Plant and Firm Characteristics Data

Firm and plant-level information comes from the Unemployment Insurance (UI) Wage Records of the State of Maryland, the 1988 Survey of Manufacturing Technology (SMT), and the 1985-1996 Standard Statistical Establishment List (SSEL). The UI Earnings Records is the source of the quarterly earnings measure we use in our analysis; forty-nine quarters worth of data covering the period between 1985:2 and 1997:2 were made available by the Jacob France Center at University of Baltimore.² Initially, UI covered only employers in the private non-farm economy with eight or more employees. Over the years, however, the system has been continuously expanded and today it provides in essence the universe of employed workers. In the UI system, a variety of administrative data is maintained, but there are three important data sets which serve as the primary source of statistical uses. First, there is a master list of more than four million subject employers which contains the names and addresses of covered firms and both actuarial and statistical information. Secondly, information from the quarterly tax reports filed by employers is maintained. Finally, in all but 12 States, firms report the total wages paid to each employee during the quarter to determine an individual's eligibility and benefit amount when filing a UI claim.

²Since 1997 the authors been members of a research team affiliated with The Jacob France Center at the University of Baltimore. The Center has maintained a data-sharing agreement with Maryland's Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation since 1991. The Department requires the Center's researchers to honor state and federal laws and administrative regulations with respect to the confidentiality of the data made available.

It is this last data set that we use in our analysis. The file contains quarterly payments made by employers operating in Maryland to each of its employees during between 1985:2 and 1997:2, thus, the usual caveats of miss-reporting and recall error that are typical of worker surveys do not apply. In addition to total quarterly earnings payments by the employer, each record contains a Social Security Number (SSN) identifying the individual receiving the payments, the Employer Identification Number (EIN) identifying the employer making the payments, and the year and quarter the record belongs to.³ These identifiers serve as links to the other data sets. A recurring issue when working with administrative earnings data is that it does not contain information on the number of hours worked or weeks worked by the worker so computation of a wage rate is not possible. Some workers will earn high wages and work few hours (which will be reflected in low quarterly earnings) while some others will work many hours for the minimum wage (which will result in high average quarterly earnings).

In our analysis of wage changes, and in order to limit the bias from unobserved labor supply effects, we restrict our sample following Topel & Ward (1992), and Lane *et al.* (1999) to include only “full quarter” jobs, thus excluding quarters where the jobs begin or end. To further control for the number of hours, we consider any quarter with earnings not reaching 70% of the minimum wage as non-employment.⁴ Thus, the wage analysis focuses on full quarter and full time jobs, and any job-quarter not meeting this threshold is considered an unemployment spell. From the UI Earnings Records we also construct quarterly

³A worker ID variable was created to replace the SSN immediately upon receiving the data. The additional security measure ensured that in fact we never worked with the actual worker SSN information. The Internal Revenue Service maintains the process for assigning EINs. An employer obtains an EIN by submitting IRS Form SS-4, Application for Employer Identification Number, to the IRS. Any business that pays wages to one or more employees is required to have an EIN as its taxpayer identifying number. There would be few, if any, employers that would not already have an EIN for taxpayer identifying purposes.

⁴This is computed as $(0.7 \times 40 \times 4 \times 3 \times \text{Minimum Wage})$.

plant level data, in particular, plant employment, dummies for whether employment expanded or contracted by more than 20% from the previous quarter, and a measure of quarterly turnover over and above the establishment's employment expansion or contraction.⁵ (See Table 1 for a description of these variables.)

Sales at the firm level are obtained from the SSEL. This is the Census Bureau's sampling frame for businesses in all industries in the United States containing data such as firm sales, employment and geographic location. Our measure of labor productivity uses SSEL data from 1985-1996 and is constructed following Haltiwanger, Lane and Spletzer (1999), and Lane, Miranda, Spletzer & Burguess (1998). It is computed as the natural log of firm sales divided by employment. The sales to employment ratio should be regarded as a proxy for labor productivity since revenue is divided by employment rather than hours, and the GDP deflator is used rather than the appropriate firm specific price deflator.

Our technology measure comes from the 1988 Survey of Manufacturing Technology (SMT). This is the Bureau of the Census plant-based sample surveying approximately 10,000 manufacturing plants on the use of 17 separate technologies. These technologies include CAD/CAM, Computer Numerically Controlled Machines lasers and robots. (See Appendix A for a list and description of SMT technologies.) The industries covered are those included in major industry groups 34 - Fabricated Metal Products, 35 - Nonelectrical Machinery, 36 - Electric and Electronic Equipment, 37 - Transportation Equipment, and 38 - Instruments and Related Products. The data from the SMT allow us to construct a technology measure by identifying how many types of advanced manufacturing technologies a manufacturing plant utilizes. We construct our measure of technology in line with Doms, Dunne and Troske (1997) to be the number of technologies a plant uses, but distinct from other commonly used measures which are based on investment in

⁵Churning is defined as in Burguess, Lane & Stevens (forthcoming).

computers and computer peripherals (e.g., Berman, Bound and Griliches (1994), Autor, Katz and Krueger (1996)). We will assume that plants that use a higher number of technologies are more technologically advanced.⁶

3. *Analytical Data Set*

Having linked the different data sets the final analytical data set consists of 547,665 quarterly records from 52 manufacturing plants in the state of Maryland employing a total of 35,628 workers. Tables 2 and 3 compare the plants and workers in our matched data set with the populations they are drawn from. Table 2 presents summary statistics for plants in our sample and for the total number of plants in the 1988 SMT. We can see that our plants are fairly representative of the total sample although they tend to use a slightly less number of technologies and are somewhat smaller. Table 3 presents summary statistics for all workers in Maryland employed in industry groups 34-38 (column 1), and for the workers in our matched data set (column 2). We can see that the comparison between the two is remarkably similar in all fronts including mean quarterly earnings, skill level, age and other demographic characteristics.

The structure of the individual data can be examined in Table 4. The rows of this table correspond to the number of quarters a person is in the sample and the columns, with the exception of column (1a), correspond to the number of employers the individual has worked for. In this table each individual contributes to a single cell but for column (1a) that represents the subset of workers from column (1) whose employing plant had at least one other individual with a previous employer in the sample.

⁶This assumption is substantiated in Doms *et al.* (1997) where they show that technology counts is highly correlated to technological intensity.

III. TWO-STEP WAGE EQUATION: A SEMI-LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

1. Description

We begin with a wage model that builds on work by Abowd *et al.* (1999) and Lane *et al.* (1999) and expand it to include a measure of technology adoption. Worker productivity is a function of observable characteristics like experience, tenure and education, but also of unobservable characteristics such as ability. Similarly, firms have been shown to affect differently the wages of econometrically identical individuals depending on their observed and unobserved characteristics like size, age, technology use or managerial ability. The individual's wage is, thus, a function not only of his/her observed and unobserved characteristics, but also of the observed and unobserved characteristics of the plant she works at including technology. Making use of Abowd *et al.* (1999) notation, consider the following wage equation:

$$w_{ijt} = \mathbf{b}_1 x_{it} + \mathbf{b}_2 p_{jt} + \mathbf{q}_i + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j(i,t)} + \mathbf{e}_{ijt} \quad (1)$$

where w_{ijt} is the logarithm of real quarterly earnings of worker $i=1, \dots, N$ working at plant $j=1, \dots, J$ during quarter $t=1, \dots, T$; x_{it} is a vector of G time-varying exogenous observed worker characteristics of individual i , p_{jt} is the vector of F time-varying observed plant characteristics, \mathbf{e}_i is the pure worker effect, $\phi_{j(i,t)}$ is the pure plant effect for the plant at which worker i is employed at date t (denoted $j(i,t)$) and \mathbf{a}_{ijt} is the statistical residual.

Further, consider the following decompositions of the pure worker effect into an observed component and an unobserved one so that

$$\mathbf{q}_i = \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{h}_{u_i} \quad (2)$$

where \hat{a}_i is the unobserved person-specific intercept, u_i is a vector of observed time-invariant individual characteristics (e.g., gender, race and skill level), and ζ is the vector of coefficients. Similarly, consider a decomposition of the pure plant effect into an observable component and an unobservable one so that

$$\mathbf{y}_j = \mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{g}R_j \quad (3)$$

where \hat{o}_j is the firm-specific intercept, R_j denotes observed technology use in plant j (or rather the fixed component associated with it) and \tilde{a} is the technology coefficient.

Failure to control for both worker and firm unobserved heterogeneity results in biased estimates of \hat{a}_1 and \hat{a}_2 , the coefficients of the observable time-varying worker and plant characteristics in equation (1). We, therefore, use a within-individual-firm estimator to control for both worker and plant fixed effects, and deal with the potential correlation between one of our regressors and worker-specific and plant-specific time-invariant components of the error term.⁷ Note, however, that estimation of fixed effects also removes the effect of our observed but time-invariant variables of interest, technology use and skill level, and therefore, we would not be able to ascertain their effects on individuals' wages.

2. *Estimation*

In order to distinguish the effect of technology on wages from the pure plant effects, we adopt a two-step estimation procedure.⁸ Step 1 involves estimating equation (1) with fixed effects to get unbiased estimates of \hat{a}_1 and \hat{a}_2 . The time-varying regressors include, for the individual, age of worker and current

job tenure, and plant age, plant size, churning and employment expansion and contraction for the plant. Tenure is actual tenure constructed from the data and is, thus, left censored. Our regression also include year dummies to control for any time trend.

Having estimated model (1), we then generate predicted values of the pure worker and plant effects by taking the residuals which contain the portion of real wages that could not be explained by our estimates of the time-varying worker and plant characteristics (b_1 and b_2) as well as time dummies:

$$w_{ijt} - b_1 x_{it} - b_2 p_{jt} = \mathbf{q}_i + \mathbf{y}_j + \mathbf{e}_{ijt} \quad (4)$$

or substituting (2) and (3) for \mathbf{e}_i and ϕ_j :

$$w_{ijt} - b_1 x_{it} - b_2 p_{jt} = \mathbf{a}_i + u_i \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{g} R_j + \mathbf{e}_{ijt} = w_{/xp} \quad (5)$$

We then average this value over our 1985-1997 period for each worker-firm pairing to get an estimate of the joint worker-plant time invariant component of the residual:

$$E_{ijt} [w_{/xt}] = u_i \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{g} R_j + \mathbf{j} S R_{[ij]}$$

In the second step of our estimation, we regress the averaged residuals on individuals' skill level and other demographic characteristics, u_i , the level of technology used in the plant where the individual works, R_j , and the interaction of the skill level and technology use, SR_{ij} , to get estimates of ζ , $\tilde{\alpha}$, and $\tilde{\phi}$.

⁷See Abowd *et al* (1999).

⁸ See Black and Lynch's (1998) for a recent application.

IV. RESULTS FROM TWO-STEP ESTIMATION

Results from the within worker-firm wage regression are presented in Table 5. Coefficients on the time varying worker characteristics are in line with standard human capital regression results and indicate that an individual's experience — as proxied by age — and also tenure increase earnings at a decreasing rate. More interesting, and in line with results in Lane *et al.* (1999), are the estimated effects of time-varying firm characteristics. We find that after controlling for worker-firm fixed effects, older plants pay less, larger firms pay relatively more, expanding firms also pay significantly more, and finally, that increases in firm productivity lead to increases in earnings. We also find that plants with higher churning have to pay more for the same workers. Focusing now on our variables of interest — technology and skill — Table 6 presents the results from the cross-sectional analysis on the estimated pure worker-firm effect. Our results indicate that workers employed in plants that have adopted a higher number of technologies earn more, and also that high skilled workers earn more than either medium or low skilled workers. These results are consistent with the cross-sectional analysis results obtained by Krueger (1993), Autor, Katz and Krueger (1996), Doms, Dunne and Troske (1997) and Entorf, Gollac and Kramarz (1997), all of whom show that technology use is associated with higher worker wages even after controlling for observable worker characteristics. As expected, we also find that higher skilled workers earn higher wages compared to their lower skilled counterparts. However, the coefficient of the interaction between skill and technology indicates that, on average, the wage premium associated with more technologically advanced plants tends to go to lower skilled workers. This result is surprisingly similar to findings by Entorf *et al.* (1997) on a cross-

sectional analysis of French data where they find that the wage premium related with computer use gets apportioned to low-education workers.⁹

V. *LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS*

We know, however, that results from this type of cross-sectional analysis suffer from omitted variable bias from worker and firm unobservable characteristics, and in fact, have been shown to change quite considerably once these aspects are controlled (Entorf, Gollac & Kramarz 1999). To see how this may be affecting our results, we supplement the 2-step regression analysis with results from a longitudinal analysis on a restricted sample of plants for which we were able to construct longitudinal technology information from the SMT. Only eight such plants could be identified due to the fact that the 1988 and 1993 SMTs are not designed to be a panel.

Our longitudinal technology sample contains a total of 118,191 quarterly records that correspond to the 7,421 individuals who worked in those eight manufacturing plants at some point between 1985 and 1997. The plants in this sample have a 1988-1993 average employment of 350 workers, which is right between the mean employment figures of the 1988 SMT and our SMT-UI sample (see Table 2). The mean number of technologies in the 1988-1993 period is 3 ranging from 0 to 9 technologies per plant. Regarding worker statistics, this sample holds a smaller proportion of whites (66% compared to our previous 80%),

⁸We rerun the cross-section analysis on the average obtained from earnings in and around 1988 since this is the SMT year we used to extract the technology information. We know the number of technologies did change for these plants between the 1985 to 1997 so by restricting the number of years to the survey year and around we attempt to increase the precision of our technology measure. We find the results don't change significantly.

and a slightly higher proportion of low skilled workers (25% compared to the 19.2% in the Maryland UI with SICs 34-38). The proportion of high skill workers, though, is preserved at around 5.5%. Finally, the mean quarterly wage is \$6,814, which is below the approximately \$8,000 in the Maryland UI (see Table 3).

The model we estimate is the same one we used in the first step of our two-step regression (equation (1)), but now it includes a time-variant measure of technology as well as the interaction of skill and technology. Results from this longitudinal regression are presented in Table 7. They show that once we control for worker and firm fixed effects, the effect of the interaction term for high skill workers becomes not significant while the interaction with low skill workers is now negative and still significant. It would appear that there is some selection of workers to technology. Workers are assigned to new technologies according to unobserved abilities, so that not only does the premium disappear once we control for unobservable characteristics for high skill workers, but it actually becomes negative for low skill workers. The negative effect on the interaction between low skill workers and technology is also suggestive of direct evidence of skill biased technical change in US manufacturing firms.

This result is not inconsistent with findings by Doms *et al.* (1997) who find no correlation between skill upgrading and technology use. The adjustment to changing demand conditions can come through wages or through employment. In an economy with flexible wages, one would expect wages — rather than jobs — of low skill workers facing changing demand conditions adjust, and in fact, fall in technologically advanced plants. This is in contrast with results on French data by Entorf *et al.* (1999) who find that the impact of technology on low education workers disappears after controlling for worker unobservable characteristics. They argue that this is consistent with wages being rigid in France, and with changes in

demand conditions being adjusted through employment changes. The U.S. economy, however, is much more dynamic, and shifts in demand are likely to be absorbed through wage changes.

VI. A MODEL OF MOBILITY

1. Description

New production processes seem to be working to reduce demand for less skilled workers. Some evidence for this was found in the previous section. However, wage adjustment may not be the only mechanism restoring the equilibrium, and in fact we might expect to see increased mobility for those workers whose wages are being affected by technology adoption whenever the new wage falls below their reservation wage. In this section, we investigate how technology adoption impacts the mobility of the worker employed in manufacturing plants located in the State of Maryland beyond the effect it has through the wage mechanism. To investigate this issue, we construct an empirical model of mobility decisions that builds on that of Topel & Ward (1992), and look at the impact technology adoption and other firm characteristics have on the probability of separation of the worker. This section specifically investigates the role played by the firm in the mobility rate of the worker. Does technology adoption or failure to adopt have an impact on the hazard rate of workers employed by the plant?

The individual seeks to maximize her wealth. As such, she makes her mobility decision by comparing the expected present value of the current job with the expected present value of the alternative (be it another job or unemployment). In our model, the expected present value is a function of the standard covariates in the literature, the wage rate (w), experience (X) and tenure (T), and we argue it is also a function of firm characteristics like technology. However, firms are not homogeneous entities; for example,

they may have different production technologies, hiring and training costs, turnover/retention or training policies even within narrowly defined industry groups.

These differences may result in different optimal wage growth paths across firms, and thus provide information beyond that conveyed by the current wage, experience or tenure on their own.¹⁰ By including specific firm characteristics, we are in fact relaxing the assumption that expected earnings growth is the same across jobs. This approach would be in line with findings by Haltiwanger *et al.* (1999) who find that surviving businesses are very different in terms of workforce composition and productivity even within narrowly defined industries. Also substantiating this approach is Margolis' (1996) finding that heterogeneity in the returns to seniority is a significant empirical phenomenon.

2. *Estimation*

In all the cases described above, observed earnings, experience and tenure are not sufficient to describe the value of a job or to make between-job comparisons for mobility decisions.¹¹ In addition to our technology measures, we also include the age and size of the plant, its employment churning rate, a quarterly dummy indicating whether the plant's employment increases or decreases by more than twenty percent, 2-digit SIC industry dummies, season dummies, and whether or not it is part of a multi-establishment firm. To

$$\mathbf{I}(w, t, x, p, \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{I}_0) = \mathbf{I}_0(t) \exp(w \mathbf{b}_0 + x' \mathbf{b}_1 + p' \mathbf{b}_2)$$

estimate this model, we adopt a proportional hazard specification:

⁹Topel & Ward (1992) only include firm size as a control and motivate their inclusion after the fact based on internal career markets.

¹⁰This insight comes from Topel (1986).

where \ddot{e}_0 is a baseline hazard, w is a real wage function, x is a vector of observable worker characteristics, p is a vector of firm observable characteristics that includes technology, and the $\hat{a}s$ are the coefficients of interest. The effect of explanatory variables in this specification is to multiply the baseline hazard \ddot{e}_0 by a factor which does not depend on duration t . Cox's (1972) partial likelihood approach can be used to estimate the $\hat{a}s$ without specifying the form of the baseline hazard function \ddot{e}_0 . The benefit of this approach is that we avoid imposing structure on the data.

VII. MOBILITY ESTIMATION RESULTS

We start by estimating the empirical hazard rate for workers by the level of technology adopted by their employer, and the gender and skill level of the worker. For this, plants are classified as 'high', 'medium' and 'low' technology. These categories correspond to plants using more than 5 technologies, between 1 and 5 technologies, and no technology respectively. Just as in our analysis regarding wages, employees are classified as 'high-skill' or 'skilled', 'medium-skill' and 'low-skill' or 'unskilled'. Table 8 and Figure 1 present results from estimating those empirical hazards. We find that the fewer the number of technologies adopted by the plant, the higher the probability of exiting that plant, and also that lower skill workers have a higher hazard of exiting. However, these results are only descriptive in nature and do not control for key mobility variables like earnings and experience.

Table 9 reports parameter estimates for various forms of the hazard function in (7). The specifications contain the usual worker heterogeneity controls like gender, race, education and age (which acts as a proxy for experience) and an age-tenure interaction. As mentioned earlier, plant variables include the number of technologies in use at the plant in 1988, the size and age of the plant, the churning rate,

dummies for whether the plant's employment expanded or contracted by 20% relative to the previous quarter, a dummy for whether the plant belongs to a multi-unit firm and also industry dummies. In addition, we control for seasonality by including calendar quarter dummies. The specifications in columns (1) through (4) do not include current wage as a control variable while the rest of them do.

The specification in column (1) omits the wage as well as the less common firm characteristics and plant technology. This specification serves as a reference point to which to compare results from other specifications. Column (1) shows that as workers age (and gain experience) their hazard rate of exit falls. The point estimate shows that every additional year reduces the probability of exit of the worker by one percentage point. Females have an 8.8% higher hazard rate of exiting the manufacturing plants than males, and non-whites have between 15 and 20% higher rate of exiting than whites. Not surprisingly, we also find that unskilled workers employed at these manufacturing plants have a 27% higher rate of exit relative to the reference group of medium skilled workers. Skilled workers fare statistically no different from this reference group. Finally, we also find that the larger the size of the plant, the lower is the probability of exit, and that workers employed for multi-unit plants have a higher probability of exiting the observed plant. Other controls include the industry at the two digit level and the quarter dummies. These results are all comparable to Topel & Ward (1992).

We then move on to column (2) where we now include less commonly used plant characteristics such as churning rate, the age of the plant, and dummies for the plant's employment expansion and contraction. Notice, though, we are not yet including our technology measure. The coefficients were all found to be strong and significant which is a clear indication that these type of plant characteristics are important in determining worker mobility. For example, not surprisingly we find that an increase of one

percent in the churning rate increases the probability of exit by 0.47%. We also find that working for an expanding plant lowers the probability of exit to 61% of that of workers employed in more stable plants, and that working for a contracting plant more than doubles the probability of exit relative to the same group. The age of the plant also has a positive effect on the hazard. The estimates indicate that for every additional year the plant has been in operation, the probability of worker exit increases 1.1%. Also worth noticing is that, compared to column (1), the size of plant effect loses 25% of its impact. This result seems to indicate that plant size was in fact partially capturing the effects of the plant's churning rate and employment expansion and contraction.

In specifications (3) and (4), we introduce technology and also explore the hypothesis that a plant's technology is correlated with other plant characteristics such as size.¹² Column (3) shows the results when we include technology and our technology-skill interaction, but exclude the size variable. In column (4) we again include plant size along with our technology variable. This way, we will be able to see how the coefficients of the technology and size variables vary, if at all.

Interestingly, our comparison of columns (3) and (4) suggest that technology and size are indeed correlated. If we were to just look at the results in column (3), we would conclude that workers in plants that use more technologies have a lower probability of exit. However, when we also control for plant size as well as technology (column (4)), we realize that workers in technologically intensive plants seem to have a higher probability of exit. The reason for these seemingly contradictory results is that it is highly likely that plant size and technology use are correlated. Size has a negative effect on the probability of exit while technology seems to have a positive effect. When we include size, but omit technology (column (2)), the

size variable picks up the positive effect of technology use and it becomes less negative by approximately 26% (as compared to column 4). Analogously, when we include technology but omit size, our technology variable picks up the negative effect of size, thus becoming (slightly) negative. Thus, as we control for both technology and plant size, as well as other worker and plant characteristics, the results in column (4) suggest that the likelihood of workers exiting is higher in technologically advanced plants while size makes them less likely to exit.

Given that this is the first empirical analysis of job mobility that uses this type of technology measure, the interpretation of our technology coefficient is not quite obvious. It could indicate that working for high-tech plants may be a signal of unobserved worker characteristics; that is, if in line with the conclusions of Doms *et al.* (1997), and Entorf *et al.* (1999), we assume that workers with higher (unobserved) ability are more likely to work at high-tech plants, then it can be argued that these workers are more likely to receive better outside job offers (i.e., their opportunity wage is higher), and thus, are more mobile and more likely to exit the plant.¹³

Turning our attention to the interaction between skill and technology, we find that, relative to medium-skill workers, unskilled workers are more likely to exit the firm the larger the number of technologies adopted by the plant. This might again may be an indication of skill biased technical change working through employment effects. The effect on the interaction is only marginally significant for skilled workers and works by reducing the risk of exit for this group. As expected, the inclusion of the technology

¹¹For instance, Troske (1997) finds that the size of the plant and capital intensity are positively correlated.

¹²This line of argument presumes that in a majority of cases, exiting the plant is a voluntary act. Our data, however, does not allow us to discern what workers are fired and which ones exit the plant voluntarily. Alternatively, it could also indicate that the adoption of a new technology requires higher quality job matches, and thus, low quality matches are dissolved earlier.

interaction with skill also affects the skill coefficients. Before the inclusion, only unskilled workers had a significantly higher risk of exiting the plant relative to medium-skill workers. However, with the addition of the interactive term, both skilled and unskilled workers now have a significantly higher risk of exiting, roughly 13 and 11% respectively.

Column (5) conditions on the log quarterly wage from the current period. Like Topel & Ward (1992), we also find that the job-specific wage is a key determinant of mobility. We find that a 10% within-career wage increase reduces the probability of leaving the job by about 9 percentage points — which is a significantly stronger impact than the 2% they obtained. Also worth noticing is that even after we control for wages, the effects of our technology and technology-skill interaction variables do not vary significantly. Thus, the hypothesis presented in relation to our column (4) results is maintained.

However, conditioning on the wage affects other estimates, and just in the way that we expect based on previous empirical studies. For example, in column (1) we found that females and non-whites had a significantly higher hazard of exit, but once we control for wages, we find that females' probability of exiting is in fact 80% that of males with similar characteristics, and that blacks have a probability of exiting that is 92.3% that of whites. These results can be an indication that these populations are faced with outside offers that are of lesser value relative to white men but it could also indicate they have a stronger preference for a stable job. The coefficient on other non-whites is now not significant.

We also see that the skill coefficient jumps from a 13% higher risk to a much higher 32% probability of exiting the plant relative to medium-skilled workers. This suggests that outside opportunities are higher for this group of workers, and thus, are more mobile. On the other hand, unskilled workers do not seem to

fare any worse than medium skilled workers.¹⁴ However, it is worth noticing that, although statistically insignificant, the coefficient of unskilled workers reverses sign and becomes negative.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Making use of a unique linked data set we have found direct evidence of skill biased technological change in US manufacturing plants. While the analysis is restricted to plants located in the State of Maryland, our analysis is consistent with other findings in the U.S. and with similar data in France. We have shown that there is a considerable selection of workers to manufacturing technologies by ability so that once we control for unobservable characteristics, the premium associated with working with these technologies disappears for high education workers. However, the effect of working with technology for low education workers reverses sign and actually becomes negative.

What in cross-sectional analysis appeared to be a premium accruing to low skilled workers employed in technologically advanced plants, in fact turned out to be a result of omitted variable bias. In fact, in our longitudinal analysis, low education workers were found to suffer a wage penalty in high technology plants. This finding is in contrast with similar analysis conducted with French data where Entorf *et al.* (1999) find that the cross-section “premium” completely disappears once they control for unobservable individual characteristics. However, this could be due to the fact that wages in the U.S. are more flexible than in France. While the French economy, one of rigid wages, adjusts to changes in relative

¹³We run an additional hazard where we include our productivity measure. Our results suggest that workers at more productive plants have a lower probability of exiting. Its inclusion does not qualitatively affect any of the previous results, although it increases the technology and the plant size coefficients.

labor demand through changes in employment, the more dynamic U.S. economy adjusts through wage changes. This wage adjustment is reflected in the technology adopting plants that we were able to identify in the U.S. manufacturing sector.

Regarding our analysis of the role of technology adoption in worker mobility, we have found that firm characteristics like size, age, churning and the number of technologies do significantly affect the probability of exit of the worker even after controlling for earnings. This indicates that wages do not fully capture the information weighed by the worker when making their mobility decision. In a larger sense, this is consistent with findings that firms are not homogeneous entities even within narrowly defined industry groups. Our findings seem to indicate that skill biased technical change acts not only through wages, but also that the adjustment takes place via the employment mechanism. Less skilled workers seem to be pushed to less technologically advanced plants. While unskilled workers are generally less mobile than either their high or medium-skill counterparts, their probability of exit increases with the number of technologies adopted.

We also find that the larger the number of technologies adopted by the plant, the higher is the probability of exit of the worker. We attribute this to the view — which is consistent with Entorf, Gollac and Kramarz (1997), and Doms, Dunne and Troske (1997)— that workers who we observe employed at technologically advanced plants tend to have higher unobserved ability, and therefore, command a higher opportunity wage which makes them more likely to exit.

The richness of the SMT data as regards to the type of technology was not fully exploited for this paper. Some of the technologies are clearly used by highly educated workers while others are used by less

educated workers. In the future, we plan to investigate this aspect of the data to see how different technology types may be affecting the different types of workers.

Table 1: Variable Definitions

Plant - Quarter Level Variables:	
Employment Expansion Dummy =	1 if quarterly employment increases by more than 20% from previous quarter
Employment Contraction Dummy =	1 if quarterly employment decreases by more than 20% from previous quarter
Churning =	$[\text{worker flow} - \text{abs}(\text{job flow})] / \text{average employment}$,
where	worker flow = hires + exits job flow = hires - exits average employment = (current employment + previous employment)/2
Firm - Year Level Variable:	
Firm Productivity Measure =	$\text{Log}(\text{Deflated Firm Annual Sales} / \text{Firm Annual Employment})$
Individual Level Variable:	
Low Skill:	High school dropout
Medium Skill:	High school graduate and some college
High Skill:	College graduates

Table 2: Sample Statistics for Plants

	1988 SMT	1988 SMT - MD UI Match
	(1)	(2)
Mean Employment	262.5	225.1
Size Class:		
1-99	45.1%	46.2%
100-499	37.7%	40.4%
500+	17.2%	13.5%
Age:		
0-4	11.4%	15.4%

5-15	31.6%	26.9%
16-30	29.8%	34.6%
30+	27.2%	23.1%
Mean Number of Technologies	3.8	3.3
Technology Classes:		
0-3	55.7%	63.4%
4-6	23.5%	25.0%
7-9	12.6%	3.8%
10+	8.3%	7.6%
Industry:		
Fabricated Metal	23.4%	32.7%
Machinery Equipment	27.3%	23.1%
Electrical Equipment	22.8%	19.2%
Transportation Equipment	13.1%	13.5%
Instruments	13.4%	11.5%
N	9,378	52

Table 3: Summary Statistics for Workers

	UI MD	1988 SMT - MD UI Match
	(1)	(2)
Mean Age	39.79	40.15
Percent Female	28.09%	26.40%
Percent White	80.13%	79.50%
Percent Black	13.38%	14.80%
Skill Level		
Low	19.19%	21.00%
Medium	75.22%	73.40%
High	5.59%	5.60%
Mean Quarterly Wage	8,285.52	8,339.90
N	201,700	35,628

**Table 4
Structure of the Individual Data by Quarters in Sample and Number of Employers**

Quarters in Sample	Number of Employers				Total
	1	1a	2	3	
1	3508	2879	0	0	3508
2	2446	2088	15	0	2461
3	2002	1657	18	1	2021
4	1568	1363	27	0	1595
5	1398	1208	12	0	1410
6	1330	1137	25	0	1355
7	1363	1209	16	1	1380
8	1269	1107	14	0	1283

9	1099	962	34	1	1134
10	1114	994	18	1	1133
11	1085	800	17	0	1102
12	844	738	17	2	863
13	836	749	24	0	860
14	755	675	18	1	774
15	746	663	10	0	756
16	756	683	11	1	768
17	724	668	12	0	736
18	854	779	20	0	874
19	683	622	14	1	698
20	451	399	17	0	468
21	470	421	19	1	490
22	525	469	16	0	541
23	441	400	14	1	456
24	575	475	8	1	584
25	401	367	14	0	415
26	404	373	9	0	413
27	332	305	7	0	339
28	440	401	10	1	451
29	430	406	6	0	436
30	260	209	15	0	275
31	330	302	8	0	338
32	290	260	5	1	296
33	281	240	7	0	288
34	283	255	10	0	293
35	355	327	6	0	361
36	360	322	2	1	363
37	367	344	5	0	372
38	610	557	15	0	625
39	148	111	6	0	154
40	158	141	3	0	161
41	228	200	6	0	234
42	199	178	4	0	203
43	341	327	4	0	345
44	571	489	4	0	575
45	104	78	2	0	106
46	184	144	2	0	186
47	1147	971	2	0	1149
Total	35065	30452	548	15	35628
Percentage	98.4%	85.5%	1.5%	0.0%	100.0%

Column 1a refers to the subset of individuals with only one employer whose employing plant had at least one other individual who had changed firms at least once during the observed period.

Table 5: Wage Regression (Step 1)
Worker and Plant Fixed Effects Absorbed
Dependent variable: Log of real wages

Variable	(1)	(2)
Worker Age 18-24	omitted	omitted

Worker Age 25-54	0.072*	0.076*
	(0.0023)	(0.003)
Worker Age 55-65	0.056*	0.055*
	(0.0029)	(0.003)
Tenure	0.013*	0.016*
	(0.0002)	(0.0002)
Tenure squared	-0.0002*	-0.0002*
	(0.000003)	(0.000004)
Log of Firm Age	-0.131*	-0.103*
	(0.0029)	(0.003)
Churning	0.052*	0.039*
	(0.0047)	(0.005)
Log of Quarterly Employment	0.091*	0.091*
	(0.0013)	(0.001)
Employment Expansion	0.026*	0.035*
	(0.0015)	(0.002)
Employment Contraction	0.001	-0.002
	(0.0022)	(0.002)
Firm Productivity Measure		0.029*
		(0.0007)
Year Dummies	Yes	Yes
N	525,658	440,405
R - squared	0.8605	0.865

* Implies Significance at the 0.05 level

(Standard Errors in parenthesis)

Table 6: Wage Regressions (Step 2)
Cross-Section Regression

Dependent variable: pure worker-firm effect (see equation (6))

Variable	No Productivity Measure	Productivity Measure
	in Step 1	in Step 1
	(1)	(2)
Constant	8.1608*	8.0115*
	(0.0029)	(0.0032)
High Skill	0.2107*	0.2212*
	(0.0042)	(0.0046)
Low Skill	-0.1568*	-0.1512*
	(0.0025)	(0.0028)
High Skill*Technology	-0.0083*	-0.0089*
	(0.0005)	(0.0006)
Low Skill*Technology	0.0070*	0.0067*
	(0.0004)	(0.0004)
Male	0.3858*	0.3766*
	(0.0012)	(0.0013)
Other race	-0.2001*	-0.2031*
	(0.0030)	(0.0033)
Black	-0.2669*	-0.2656*
	(0.0016)	(0.0017)
Technology	0.0069*	0.0014*
	(0.0002)	(0.0002)
Multi-Unit Dummy	0.0475*	0.0352*
	(0.0017)	(0.0018)
Industry Dummies	Yes	Yes
N	35,544	34,006
R - squared	0.272	0.2615
* Implies Significance at the 0.05 level		
(Standard errors in parenthesis)		

Table 7: Longitudinal Analysis
Worker and Plant Fixed Effects Absorbed

Dependent variable: Log of Real Wages

Variable	(1)	(2)
Worker Age 18-54	Omitted	Omitted
Worker Age 25-54	0.0834* (0.0058)	0.0869* (0.0059)
Worker Age 55-55+	0.0393* (0.0073)	0.0438* (0.0074)
Tenure	0.0235* (0.0006)	0.0235* (0.0006)
Tenure squared	-0.0001* (0.00001)	-0.0001* (0.000008)
Log of Firm Age	-0.1129* (0.0083)	-0.1056* (0.0087)
Churning	0.2481* (0.0141)	0.2508* (0.0141)
Log of Quarterly Employment	0.1774* (0.0031)	0.1780* (0.0032)
Employment Expansion	0.0780* (0.0033)	0.0778* (0.0033)
Employment Contraction	-0.0224* (0.0040)	-0.0221* (0.0040)
High Skill*Technology		-0.0013 (0.0019)
Low Skill*Technology		-0.0056* (0.0015)
Number of Technologies		0.0028* (0.0009)
Year Dummies	Yes	Yes
N	114,949	114,949
R - squared	0.81845	0.81849

* Implies Significance at the 0.05 level

(Standard errors in parenthesis)

Table 8: Empirical Mobility Functions by Technology Class, Gender & Skill

	Current Job Tenure (Quarters)												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
<i>Technology Class</i>													
Low Tech	0.19	0.16	0.16	0.11	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.09
Medium Tech	0.16	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05
High Tech	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.08
<i>Technology Class & Male</i>													
Low Tech	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.09
Medium Tech	0.16	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.05
High Tech	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08
<i>Technology Class & Female</i>													
Low Tech	0.20	0.15	0.16	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.08	0.09
Medium Tech	0.15	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.05
High Tech	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.08	0.08
<i>Technology & Skill</i>													
Low Tech Unskilled	0.23	0.19	0.21	0.13	0.15	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.05
Low Tech Skilled	0.14	0.14	0.11	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.12	0.17	0.21
Med. Tech Unskilled	0.18	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.05
Med. Tech Skilled	0.12	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.04	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.04
High Tech Unskilled	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.06	0.10	0.08
High Tech Skilled	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.10
<i>Technology & Skill & Male</i>													
Low Tech Unskilled	0.23	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.15	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.06	0.05	0.09	0.04
Low Tech Skilled	0.13	0.12	0.13	0.10	0.06	0.12	0.14	0.16	0.13	0.07	0.12	0.13	
Med. Tech Unskilled	0.18	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.05
Med. Tech Skilled	0.11	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.08	0.03	0.04	0.03
High Tech Unskilled	0.16	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.09
High Tech Skilled	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.10
All sets of Mobility functions are statistically different under the Log-Rank, Wilcoxon and LR tests.													

Figure 1




Table 9: Cox Proportional Hazard: Coefficients (^a implies Time-Varying)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Current Wage ^a	-	-	-	-	-0.907* (0.0147)
Female	0.085* (0.0134)	0.073* (0.0138)	0.080* (0.0138)	0.073* (0.0138)	-0.220* (0.0145)
Black	0.143* (0.0165)	0.118* (0.0170)	0.129* (0.0170)	0.116* (0.0170)	-0.080* (0.0173)
Other Race	0.180* (0.0343)	0.121* (0.0354)	0.098* (0.0354)	0.133* (0.0354)	-0.049 (0.0358)
Race Not Reported	-0.006 (0.0401)	-0.031 (0.0414)	-0.036 (0.0414)	-0.032 (0.0414)	0.014 (0.0414)
Skilled	0.037 (0.0256)	0.035 (0.0262)	0.125* (0.0486)	0.120* (0.0486)	0.281* (0.0481)
Unskilled	0.227* (0.0146)	0.219* (0.0150)	0.105* (0.0263)	0.106* (0.0264)	-0.029 (0.0264)
Log Worker Age ^a	-0.017* (0.0008)	-0.014* (0.0008)	-0.015* (0.0008)	-0.015* (0.0008)	-0.004 (0.0008)
Age-Tenure Interaction	0.001* (0.0001)	0.001* (0.0001)	0.001* (0.0001)	0.001* (0.0001)	0.000 (0.0001)
Log Age Firm ^a	-	0.018* (0.0008)	0.015* (0.0008)	0.018* (0.0008)	0.025* (0.0008)
Log Size Firm ^a	-0.195* (0.0062)	-0.146* (0.0072)	-	-0.198* (0.0088)	-0.147* (0.0090)
Log Churn ^a	-	0.477* (0.0090)	0.500* (0.0096)	0.505* (0.0094)	0.494* (0.0095)

Expand 20% ^a	-	-0.102*	-0.110*	-0.121*	-0.060*
		(0.0262)	(0.0263)	(0.0263)	(0.0263)
Contract 20% ^a	-	1.078*	1.186*	1.073*	1.073*
		(0.0303)	(0.0300)	(0.0303)	(0.0303)
Number of Technologies	-	-	-0.012*	0.023*	0.029*
			(0.0023)	(0.0028)	(0.0029)
Technology-Skilled Interaction	-	-	-0.014*	-0.014*	-0.014*
			(0.0066)	(0.0066)	(0.0065)
Technology-Unskilled Interaction	-	-	0.024*	0.023*	0.024*
			(0.0041)	(0.0041)	(0.0041)
Multi-Unit	0.216*	0.285*	0.075*	0.337*	0.430*
	(0.0219)	(0.0232)	(0.0209)	(0.0238)	(0.0238)
SIC 35	0.233*	0.182*	0.053*	0.163*	0.072*
	(0.0237)	(0.0246)	(0.0243)	(0.0248)	(0.0248)
SIC 36	0.030*	0.173*	0.084*	0.136*	0.139*
	(0.0241)	(0.0258)	(0.0258)	(0.0261)	(0.0263)
SIC 37	0.322*	0.284*	-0.018	0.335*	0.335*
	(0.0245)	(0.0265)	(0.0221)	(0.0270)	(0.0270)
SIC 38	0.211*	0.306*	0.205*	0.170*	0.324*
	(0.0268)	(0.0282)	(0.0313)	(0.0316)	(0.0322)
Winter	-1.099*	-0.902*	-0.896*	-0.909*	-0.911*
	(0.0172)	(0.0181)	(0.0182)	(0.0182)	(0.0181)
Spring	0.004	0.134*	0.140*	0.140*	0.106*
	(0.0162)	(0.0170)	(0.0170)	(0.0170)	(0.0170)
Fall	0.077*	0.166*	0.202*	0.157*	0.151*
	(0.0165)	(0.0173)	(0.0172)	(0.0173)	(0.0172)
Observations	36,184	36,184	36,184	36,184	36,184
-2 log likelihood	576,549.65	535,685.9	536,026.1	535,546.6	531,831.1
* implies significance at the 0.05 level					
(Standard errors in parenthesis)					

Table 10: Cox Proportional Hazard: Hazard Ratios (^a implies Time-Varying)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Current Wage ^a	-	-	-	-	0.404
Female	1.089	1.076	1.075	1.083	0.802
Black	1.153	1.125	1.124	1.138	0.923
Other Race	1.198	1.129	1.143	1.103	0.953
Race Not Reported	0.994	0.970	0.969	0.964	1.014
Skilled	1.038	1.036	1.128	1.133	1.324
Unskilled	1.256	1.245	1.112	1.111	0.971
Log Worker Age ^a	0.983	0.986	0.985	0.985	0.996
Age-Tenure Interaction	1.001	1.001	1.001	1.001	1.000
Log Age Firm ^a	-	1.018	1.018	1.015	1.025
Log Size Firm ^a	0.824	0.865	0.820	-	0.864
Log Churn ^a	-	1.612	1.657	1.648	1.639
Expand 20% ^a	-	0.903	0.886	0.896	0.942
Contract 20% ^a	-	2.940	2.924	3.274	2.925
Number of Technologies	-	-	1.023	0.988	1.030
Technology-Skilled Interaction	-	-	0.986	0.987	0.986

Technology-Unskilled Interaction	-	-	1.024	1.024	1.024
Log Av. Productivity ^a	-	-	-	-	-
Multi-Unit	1.241	1.330	1.401	1.078	1.537
SIC 35	1.262	1.199	1.178	1.054	1.075
SIC 36	1.031	1.189	1.145	1.088	1.149
SIC 37	1.380	1.329	1.399	0.982	1.398
SIC 38	1.234	1.355	1.185	1.227	1.382
Winter	0.333	0.406	0.403	0.408	0.402
Spring	1.004	1.144	1.150	1.151	1.111
Fall	1.080	1.180	1.170	1.223	1.163
<hr/>					
Observations	36,184	36,184	36,184	36,184	36,184
-2 log likelihood	576,549.65	535,685.9	536,026.1	535,546.6	531,831.1

APPENDIX A:

Description of Technologies

Computer-Aided Design (CAD)

Use of computers for drawing and designing parts or products for analysis and testing of designed parts and products.

CAD-Controlled Machines

Use of CAD output for controlling machines used to manufacture the part of product.

Digital CAD

Use of digital representation of CAD output for controlling machines used to manufacture the part or product.

Flexible Manufacturing Systems/Cell

Two or more machines with automated material handling capabilities controlled by computers or programmable controllers, capable of single path acceptance of raw materials and delivery of finished product.

Numerically Controlled Machines/Computer Numerically Controlled Machines

NC machines are controlled by numerical commands punched on paper or plastic mylar tape while CNC machines are controlled through an internal computer.

Materials Working Lasers

Laser technology used for welding, cutting, treating, scrubbing and marking.

Pick/Place Robot

A simple robot with 1-3 degrees of freedom, which transfer items from place to place.

Other Robots

A reprogrammable, multifunctioned manipulator designed to move materials, parts, tools or specialized devices through variable programmed motions.

Automatic Storage/Retrieval Systems

Computer-controlled equipment providing for the automatic handling and storage of materials, parts, and finished products.

Automatic Guided Vehicle Systems

Vehicles equipped with automatic guidance devices programmed to follow a path that interfaces with workstations for automated or manual loading of materials, parts, tools or products.

Technical Data Network

Use of local area network (LAN) technology to exchange technical data within design and engineering departments.

Factory Network

Use of LAN technology to exchange information between different points on the factory floor.

Intercompany Computer Network

Intercompany computer network linking plant to subcontractors, suppliers or customers.

Programmable Controllers

A solid state industrial control device that has programmable memory for storage of instructions, which performs functions equivalent to a relay panel or wired solid state logic control system.

Computers used on Factory Floor

Exclude computers used solely for data acquisitions or monitoring. Include computers that may be dedicated to control, but which are capable of being reprogrammed for other functions.

Automated Sensors used on Inputs

Automated equipment used to perform tests and inspections on incoming or in-process materials.

Automated Sensors used on Final Product

Automated equipment used to perform tests and inspections on final products.

REFERENCES

- Abowd, John M., Kramarz, Francis and Margolis, David N. "High Wage Workers and High Wage Firms," *Econometrica* 67 (March 1999):251-333
- Autor, David, Katz, Lawrence, and Krueger, Alan, "Computing Inequality: Have Computers Changed the Labor Market?" NBER Working Paper No. 5956, 1997.
- Berman, Eli, Bound, John, and Griliches, Zvi, "Changes in the Demand for Skilled Labor within U.S. Manufacturing Industries: Evidence from the Annual Survey of manufacturing," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CIX (May 1994):367-98.
- Berndt, Ernst, Morrison, Catherine, and Rosenblum, Larry, "High-Tech Capital Formation and Labor Composition in U.S. Manufacturing Industries: An Exploratory Analysis," NBER Working Paper No. 4010, 1992.
- Black, Sandra, and Lynch, Lisa, "How to Compete: The Impact of Workplace Practices and Information Technology on Productivity," NBER Working Paper No.6120, 1997.
- Bound, John, and Johnson, George, "Changes in the Structure of Wages in the 1980's: An Evaluation of Alternative Explanations," *The American Economic Review* 82, (June 1992):371-393
- Burgess, Simon M., Lane, Julia I. and Stevens, David W. "Job Flows, Worker Flows and Churning," *Journal of Labor Economics* (Forthcoming.)
- Davis, Steve J., & Haltiwanger, John, "Wage Dispersion Between and Within U.S. Manufacturing Plants: 1963-86," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Microeconomics* (1991):115-201
- Doms, Mark, Dunne, Timothy, and Troske, Kenneth, "Workers, Wages, and Technology," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CXII (February 1997):253-290.
- Dunne, Timothy, and Schmitz, James, Jr., "Wages, Employment Structure and Employer-Size Wage Premia: Their Relationship to Advanced-Technology Usage at U.S. Manufacturing Establishments," *Economica*, LXII (March 1995):89-107.
- Entorf, Horst, Gollac, Michel and Kramarz, Francis, "New Technologies, Wages and Worker Selection," *Journal of Labor Economics* (forthcoming June 1999.)
- Goux, D. and Maurin, E. "The Decline in Demand for Unskilled Labor: An Empirical Analysis Method and its Application to France," *Journal of Labor Economics* (forthcoming June 1999)

Haltiwanger, John C., Lane, Julia I. and Spletzer, James R. "Productivity Differences Across Employers: The Role of Employer Size, Age, and Human Capital," *American Economic Review Proceedings* (May 1999):94-98.

Krueger, Alan, "How Computers Changed the Wage Structure: Evidence from Microdata, 1984-1989," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CVIII (February 1993):33-60.

Lane, Julia I., Miranda, Javier C., Spletzer, James R. and Burgess, Simon M., "The Effect of Worker Reallocation on the Earnings Distribution: Longitudinal Evidence from Linked Data," *The Creation and Analysis of Employer-Employee Matched Data*.

Sachs, Jeffrey, and Shatz, Howard, "Trade and Jobs in U.S. Manufacturing," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1 (1994):1-84.

Spletzer, James R. "Technical Report: Sales Data in the SSEL, and the Economic Census," Working Paper, June 1998.

Topel, Robert and Ward, Michael, "Job Mobility and the Careers of Young Men," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107, (May 1992):439-480.

CENTER FOR ECONOMIC STUDIES DISCUSSION PAPERS

CES Discussion Papers are available in two subscription formats: (INTERNET and Yearly Series single paper copy.) Ordering information is found on the attached *CES Discussion Paper Subscription & Request Form*. In addition, papers are sold individually for the amount of \$5.00 per paper.

- 00-13 "Technology Use and Worker Outcomes: Direct Evidence from Linked Employee-Employer Data," by Adela Luque and Javier Miranda, 8/00.
- 00-12 "An Option-Value Approach to Technology in U.S. Manufacturing: Evidence from Plant-Level Data," by Adela Luque, 7/00.
- 00-11 "County-Level Estimates of the Employment Prospects of Low-Skill Workers," by David C. Ribar, 7/00.
- 00-10 "Measuring the Electronic Economy: Current Status and Next Steps," by B.K. Atrostic, John Gates, and Ron Jarmin, 6/00.
- 00-09 "The 1989 Change in the Definition of Capacity: A Plant-Level Perspective," by Maura P. Doyle, 6/00.
- 00-08 "Plants and Productivity in International Trade," by Andrew B. Bernard, Jonathan Eaton, J. Bradford Jensen, and Samuel Kortum, 5/00.
- 00-07 "Exporting and Productivity," by Andrew B. Bernard and J. Bradford Jensen, 5/00.
- 00-06 "The Impact of Vintage and Survival on Productivity: Evidence from Cohorts of U.S. Manufacturing Plants," by J. Bradford Jensen, Robert H. McGuckin, and Kevin J. Stiroh, 5/00.
- 00-05 "Technological Change and Economies of Scale in U.S. Poultry Slaughter," by Michael Ollinger, James MacDonald, and Milton Madison, 4/00.
- 00-04 "Differences in Job Growth and Persistence in Services and Manufacturing," by Catherine Armington and Zoltan Acs, 3/00.
- 00-03 "Scale Economies and Consolidation in Hog Slaughter," by James M. MacDonald and Michael E. Ollinger, 3/00.
- 00-02 "The Impact of Ownership Changes: A View From Labor Markets," by Robert H. McGuckin and Sang Nguyen, 3/00.
- 00-01 "Wage and Productivity Dispersion in U.S. Manufacturing: The Role of Computer Investment," by Timothy Dunne, Lucia Foster, John Haltiwanger, and Kenneth Troske, 3/00.
- 99-18 "New data for Dynamic Analysis: The Longitudinal Establishment and Enterprise Microdata (LEEM) File," by Alicia Robb, 12/99.
- 99-17 "Productivity and Acquisitions in U.S. Coal Mining" by David R.

Merrell, 12/99.

- 99-16** "Gross Job Flows and Firms," by Scott Schuh and Robert K. Triest, 12/99.
- 99-15** "Employment Adjustment Costs and Establishment Characteristics," by Lucia Foster, 11/99.
- 99-14** "Job Flow Dynamics in the Service Sector," by Zoltan J. Acs and Catherine Armington, 10/99.
- 99-13** "Are Some Firms Better at IT? Differing Relationships between Productivity and IT Spending," by Kevin Stolarick, 10/99.
- 99-12** "The Market for Corporate Assets: Who Engages in Mergers and Asset Sales and are There Efficiency Gains?," by Vojislav Maksimovic and Gordon Phillips, 10/99.
- 99-11** "Do Conglomerate Firms Allocate Resources Inefficiently?," by Vojislav Maksimovic and Gordon Phillips, 10/99.
- 99-10** "IT Spending and Firm Productivity: Additional Evidence from the Manufacturing Sector," by Kevin Stolarick, 10/99.
- 99-9** "Costs of Air Quality Regulation," by Randy Becker and J. Vernon Henderson, 9/99.
- 99-8** "The Characteristics of Business Owners Database, 1992," by Brian Headd, 8/99.
- 99-7** "On the Sources and Size of Employment Adjustment Costs," by Lucia Foster, 5/99.
- 99-6** "Large Plant Data in the LRD: Selection of a Sample for Estimation," by Phoebus J. Dhrymes and Linda Moeller, 5/99.
- 99-5** "The Winner's Curse of Human Capital," by Thomas Astebro and Irwin Bernhardt, 5/99.
- 99-4** "Bank Loans as Predictors of Small Business Start-Up Survival," by Thomas Astebro and Irwin Bernhardt, 4/99.
- 99-3** "Does Firms' Financial Status Affect Plant-Level Investment and Exit Decisions?," by Joachim K. Winter, 3/99.
- 99-2** "Government Technical Assistance Programs and Plant Survival: The Role of Plant Ownership Type," by Ronald Jarmin, 2/99.
- 99-1** "Measures Job Flow Dynamics in the U.S. Economy," by Zoltan J. Acs, Catherine Armington, and Alicia Robb, 1-99.
- 98-20** "The Impact of State Urban Enterprise Zones on Business Outcomes," by Robert T. Greenbaum and John B. Engberg, 12/98.

- 98-19 "Localized Effects of California's Military Base Realignments: Evidence from Multi-Sector Longitudinal Microdata," by C.J. Krizan, 12/98.
- 98-18 "New Evidence on Sex Segregation and Sex Differences in Wages from Matched Employee-Employer Data," by Kimberly Bayard, Judith Hellerstein, David Neumark, and Kenneth Troske, 12/98.
- 98-17 "Microenterprise as an Exit Route from Poverty: Recommendations for Programs and Policy Makers," by Timothy Bates, 11/98.
- 98-16 "The Manufacturing Plant Ownership Change Database: Its Construction and Usefulness," by Sang Nguyen, 11/98. Journal of Economic and Social Measurement (forthcoming).
- 98-15 "Mergers and Acquisitions in the United States: 1990-1994," by Catherine Armington and Alicia Robb, 11/98.
- 98-14 "Optimal Firm Size and the Growth of Conglomerate and Single-Industry Firms," by Vojislav Maksimovic and Gordon Phillips, 11/98.
- 98-13 "Exiting Self-Employment: An Analysis of Asian Immigrant-Owned Small Businesses," by Timothy Bates, 10/98.
- 98-12 "Aggregate Productivity Growth: Lessons from Microeconomic Evidence," by Lucia Foster, John Haltiwanger, and C.J. Krizan, 9/98.
- 98-11 "Job Reallocation and the Business Cycle: New Facts for and Old Debate," by Scott Schuh and Robert K. Triest, 9/98.
- 98-10 "The Census of Construction Industries Database," by Mark A. Calabria, 8/98.
- 98-9 "Longitudinal Establishment and Enterprise Microdata (LEEM) Documentation," by Zoltan J. Acs and Catherine Armington, 7/98.
- 98-8 "Manufacturing Extension and Productivity Dynamics" by Ronald S. Jarmin, 6/98.
- 98-7 "Labor Productivity: Structural Change and Cyclical Dynamics" by Martin Neil Baily, Eric J. Bartelsman, and John Haltiwanger 5/98.
- 98-6 "Factor Substitution in U.S. Manufacturing: Does Plant Size Matter?" by Sang V. Nguyen and Mary L. Streitwieser, 4/98.
- 98-5 "The Contribution of Establishment Births and Deaths to Employment Growth" by James R. Spletzer, 4/98.
- 98-4 "Immigrant Status, Race, and Institutional Choice in Higher Education" by J. Farley Ordovensky and Alison P. Hagy, 3/98.
- 98-3 "Geographic Concentration as a Dynamic Process" by Guy Dumais,

Glenn Ellison and Edward L. Glaeser, 2/98.

- 98-2** "Industrial Spillovers in Developing Countries: Plant-Level Evidence from Chile, Mexico and Morocco" by C.J. Krizan, 1/98.
- 98-1** "Matching the QFR to the LRD" by Gordon M. Phillips, 1/98.
- 97-18** "Measuring the Performance of Government Technology Programs: Lessons from Manufacturing Extension" by Ronald S. Jarmin and J. Bradford Jensen, 12/97.
- 97-17** "Productivity Adjustments and Learning-By-Doing as Human Capital" by Jim Bessen, 11/97.
- 97-16** "An Applied General Equilibrium Model of Moroccan Trade Liberalization Featuring External Economies" by C.J. Krizan, 11/97.
- 97-15** "The Structure of firm R&D and the Factor Intensity of Production" by James D. Adams, 10/97.
- 97-14** "Understanding Selection Processes: Organization Determinants and Performance Outcomes" by Peter Cappelli and Steffi L. Wilk, 10/97.
- 97-13** "The Eclipse of the U.S. Tire Industry" by Raghuram Rajan, Paolo Volpin and Luigi Zingales, 9/97.
- 97-12** "Are We Overstating the Economic Costs of Environmental Protection?" by Richard D. Morgenstern, William A. Pizer and Jhih-Shyang Shih, 9/97.
- 97-11** "The Diffusion of Modern Manufacturing Practices: Evidence from the Retail-Apparel Sectors" by Margaret Y. Hwang and David Weil, 8/97.
- 97-10** "Output Price and Markup Dispersion in Micro Data The Roles of Producer Heterogeneity and Noise" by Mark J. Roberts and Dylan Supina, 8/97.
- 97-9** "Environmental Regulation, Investment Timing, and Technology Choice" by Wayne B. Gray and Ronald Shadbegian, 7/97.
- 97-8** "Manufacturing Plant Location: Does State Pollution Regulation Matter?" by Wayne B. Gray, 7/97.
- 97-7** "The Silver Lining of Rust Belt Manufacturing Decline: Killing off Pollution Externalities" by Matthew E. Kahn, 6/97.
- 97-6** "The Rural-Urban Gap in Manufacturing and Wages: Effects of industry Mix and Region" by H. Frederick Gale, Jr., 6/97.
- 97-5** "Survival Patterns Among Newcomers to Franchising" by Tim Bates, 5/97.
- 97-4** "Capital-Energy Substitution Revisited: New Evidence from Micro

- Data" by Sang V. Nguyen and Mary L. Streitwieser, 4/97.
- 97-3 "Productivity Races II: The Issue of Capital Measurement" by Douglas Dyer, 3/97.
- 97-2 "Productivity Races I: Are some Productivity Measures Better than Others?" by Douglas Dwyer, 2/97.
- 97-1 "Survival Patterns Among Newcomers to Franchising" by Timothy Bates, 1/97.
- 96-14 "Evidence on the Link Between Firm-Level and Aggregate Inventory Behavior," by Scott Schuh, 12/96.
- 96-13 "Business Failure in the 1992 Establishment Universe Sources of Population Heterogeneity" by Alfred Nucci, 12/96.
- 96-12 "Efficiency of Bankrupt Firms and Industry Conditions: Theory and Evidence" by Vojislav Maksimovic and Gordon Phillips, 12/96.
- 96-11 "Whittling Away at Productivity Dispersion Further Notes: Persistent Dispersion or Measurement Error?" by Douglas Dwyer, 11/96.
- 96-10 "Firm Performance and Evolution: Empirical Regularities in the U.S. Microdata" by J. Bradford Jensen and Robert H. McGuckin, 10/96.
- 96-9 "Financing Small Business Creation: The Case of Chinese and Korean Immigrant Entrepreneurs" by Timothy Bates, 9/96.
- 96-8 "Measuring the Impact of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership" Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, by Ronald S. Jarmin, 9/96.
- 96-7 "Technology and Jobs: Secular Changes and Cyclical Dynamics" by Timothy Dunne, John Haltiwanger and Kenneth R. Troske, 9/96.
- 96-6 "Interfirm Segregation and the Black/White Wage Gap" by William J. Carrington and Kenneth R. Troske, 8/96.
- 96-5 "Learning by Doing and Plant Characteristics" by Ronald S. Jarmin, 8/96.
- 96-4 "Sex Segregation in U.S. Manufacturing" by William J. Carrington and Kenneth R. Troske, 6/96.
- 96-3 "Are Fixed Effects Fixed?" by Douglas Dwyer, 5/96.
- 96-2 "The Effect of Technology Use on Productivity Growth", Journal of Economics of Innovation and Technology, Vol. 6, January 2, 1998. by Robert H. McGuckin, Mary L. Streitwieser, and Mark E. Doms 8/96.

- 96-1 "Evaluation and Use of the Pollution Abatement Costs and Expenditures Survey Micro Data", "Using the Pollution Abatement Costs and Expenditures Micro Data for Descriptive and Analytic Research," Journal of Economic and Social Measurement, by Mary L. Streitwieser 3/96.
- 95-14 "Innovation and Regulation in the Pesticide Industry", by Michael Ollinger and Jorge Fernandez-Cornejo, 12/95.
- 95-13 "Exploring the Role of Acquisition in the Performance of Firms: Is the "Firm" the Right Unit of Analysis?", by Robert H. McGuckin and Sang V. Nguyen, 11/95.
- 95-12 "The Missing Link: Technology, Productivity, and Investment", by Laura Power, 10/95.
- 95-11 "Counting the Self-Employed From Two Perspectives: Household vs. Business Sample Data", by Richard J. Boden and Alfred R. Nucci, 9/95.
- 95-10 "The Worker-Establishment Characteristics Database", by Kenneth R. Troske, 6/95. Forthcoming in Labor Statistics Measurement Issue, eds. John Haltiwanger, Marilyn Manser, and Robert Topel. Chicago: NBER.
- 95-9 "Retail Inventories, Internal Finance, and Aggregate Fluctuations: Evidence from Firm-Level Panel Data", by Egon Zakrajsek, 5/95.
- 95-8 "The Impact of Ownership Change on Employment, Wages, and Labor Productivity in U.S. Manufacturing 1977-87", by Robert H. McGuckin, Sang V. Nguyen, and Arnold P. Reznick, 4/95. Forthcoming in Labor Statistics Measurement Issue, eds. John Haltiwanger, Marilyn Manser, and Robert Topel. Chicago: NBER.
- 95-7 "Using Matched Client and Census Data to Evaluate the Performance of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership", by Ron S. Jarmin, 4/95.
- 95-6 "Technology Locks, Creative Destruction and Non-Convergence in Productivity Levels", By Douglas Dwyer, 4/95.
- 95-5 "Whittling Away at Productivity Dispersion", by Douglas Dwyer, 3/95.
- 95-4 "Capital Structure and Product Market Behavior: An Examination of Plant Exit and Investment Decisions", by Dan Kovenock and Gordon M. Phillips, 3/95.
- 95-3 "Capital Structure and Product Market Rivalry: How Do We Reconcile Theory and Evidence?", by Dan Kovenock and Gordon Phillips, 2/95.
- 95-2 "Small Businesses Do Appear to Benefit from State/Local Government Economic Development Assistance", by Timothy Bates, 2/95.

- 95-1 "Preferential Procurement Programs do not Necessarily Help Minority-Owned Businesses", by Timothy Bates and Darrell Williams, 1/95.
- 94-14 "Pollution Abatement Costs, Regulation and Plant-Level Productivity", by Wayne B. Gray and Ronald J. Shadbegian, 12/94.
- 94-13 "Exporters, Skill Upgrading and the Wage Gap," by Andrew B. Bernard and J. Bradford Jensen, 11/94. Forthcoming, 1996 Journal of International Economics.
- 94-12 "Primary Versus Secondary Production Techniques in U.S. Manufacturing," by Joe Matthey, 10/94.
- 94-11 "Capital Adjustment Patterns in Manufacturing Plants," by Mark Doms and Timothy Dunne, 8/94.
- 94-10 "Evidence on the Employer Size-Wage Premium From Worker-Establishment Matched Data," by Kenneth R. Troske, 8/94.
- 94-9 "A Guide to R & D Data at the Center for Economic Studies U.S. Bureau of the Census," by James D. Adams and SuZanne Peck, 8/94.
- 94-8 "Cross Sectional Variation in Toxic Waste Releases from the U.S. Chemical Industry," by Mary L. Streitwieser, 8/94.
- 94-7 "The Span of the Effect of R&D in the Firm and Industry," by James D. Adams and Adam B. Jaffe, 6/94.
- 94-6 "Regulation and Firm Size, Foreign-Based Company Market Presence, Merger Choice in the U.S. Pesticide Industry," by Michael Ollinger and Jorge Fernandez-Cornejo, 6/94.
- 94-5 "Recent Twists of the Wage Structure and Technology Diffusion" by James D. Adams, 6/94.
- 94-4 "Downsizing and Productivity Growth: Myth or Reality?" by Martin Neil Baily, Eric J. Bartelsman and John Haltiwanger, 5/94. NBER Working Paper, Number 4741.
- 94-3 "Firms Started as Franchises Have Lower Survival Rates than Independent Small Business Startups," by Timothy Bates 5/94.
- 94-2 "A Comparison of Job Creation and Job Destruction in Canada and the United States," by John Baldwin, Timothy Dunne, and John Haltiwanger, 5/94.
- 94-1 "The Choice of Input-Output Table Embedded in Regional Econometric Input-Output Models," by Philip R. Israilevich, R. Mahidara, and Geoffrey J.D. Hewings, 1/94.
- 93-16 "The Financial Performance of Whole Company LBOs," by William F. Long and David J. Ravenscraft, 11/93.

- 93-15 "On Productivity and Plant Ownership Change: New Evidence from the LRD," by Robert H. McGuckin and Sang V. Nguyen, 11/93. The Rand Journal of Economics, Volume 26, Number 2, Summer 1995, pp. 257-276.
- 93-14 "Testing the Advantages of Using Product Level Data to Create Linkages Across Industrial Coding Systems," by SuZanne Peck, 10/93. Proceedings of the International Conference on Establishment Surveys, America Statistical Association (1994).
- 93-13 "The Long-Run Demand for Labor: Estimates from Census Establishment Data," by Timothy Dunne and Mark J. Roberts, 9/93.
- 93-12 "Construction of Regional Input-Output Tables from Establishment-Level Microdata: Illinois, 1982," by Eduardo Martins, 8/93.
- 93-11 "Determinants of Survival and Profitability Among Asian Immigrant-Owned Small Businesses," by Timothy Bates, 8/93. Social Forces, Volume 72, Number 3, pp. 671-689.
- 93-10 "The Importance of Establishment Data in Economic Research," by Robert H. McGuckin, 8/93. Proceedings of the International Conference on Establishment Surveys, 1993, and forthcoming, Journal of Economics and Business Statistics.
- 93-9 "Energy Intensity, Electricity Consumption, and Advanced Manufacturing Technology Usage," by Mark E. Doms and Timothy Dunne, 7/93.
- 93-8 "Evidence on IO Technology Assumptions from the Longitudinal Research Database," by Joe Matthey, 5/93.
- 93-7 "Asymmetric Learning Spillovers," by Ronald S. Jarmin, 4/93.
- 93-6 "Environmental Regulation and Manufacturing Productivity at the Plant Level," by Wayne B. Gray and Ronald J. Shadbegian, 3/93.
- 93-5 "Inter Fuel Substitution and Energy Technology Heterogeneity in U.S. Manufacturing," by Mark E. Doms, 3/93.
- 93-4 "Learning By Doing and Competition in the Early Rayon Industry," Ronald S. Jarmin, 2/93. RAND Journal of Economics. (Autumn 1994) Volume 25, Number 3, 441-454.
- 93-3 "LBOs, Debt and R&D Intensity," by William F. Long and David J. Ravenscraft, 2/93. The Deal Decade, 1993, Margaret M. Blair, ed., Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- 93-2 "Science, R&D, and Invention Potential Recharge: U.S. Evidence," by James D. Adams, 1/93. American Economic Review, (May 1993)
- 93-1 "Academic Science, Industrial R&D, and the Growth of Inputs," by

James D. Adams and Leo Sveikauskas, 1/93.

- 92-16** "Decomposing Learning by Doing in New Plants," by Byong-Hyong Bahk and Michael Gort, 12/92. Journal of Political Economy, Volume 101, Number 4, August 1993.
- 92-15** "Wages, Employer Size-Wage Premia and Employment Structure: Their Relationship to Advanced-Technology Usage at U.S. Manufacturing Establishments," by Timothy Dunne and James A. Schmitz, Jr., 12/92. Economica, March 1995
- 92-14** "Manufacturing Establishments Reclassified Into New Industries: The Effect of Survey Design Rules," by Robert H. McGuckin and SuZanne Peck, 11/92. Journal of Economic and Social Measurement, Volume 1, Number 2 (1993).
- 92-13** "Gender Segregation in Small Firms," by William J. Carrington and Kenneth R. Troske, 10/92. Revised, May 1993. Journal of Human Resources. Volume 39, Number. 3 (Summer 1995) pp. 503-533.
- 92-12** "The Aggregate Implications of Machine Replacement: Theory and Evidence," by Russell Cooper and John Haltiwanger, 10/92. The American Economic Review, Volume 83, Number 3, pp. 360-382, (June 1993).
- 92-11** "Managerial Tenure, Business Age and Small Business Dynamics," by Thomas J. Holmes and James A. Schmitz, Jr., 9/92. Journal of Labor Economics, Volume 14, Number 1 (1996) pp. 79-99.
- 92-10** "The Time-Series Pattern of Firm Growth in Two Industries," by Kenneth R. Troske, 9/92. Forthcoming in Journal of Law and Economics as The Dynamic Adjustment Process of Firm Entry and Exit in Manufacturing, Finance Insurance and Real Estate.
- 92-9** "The Structure of Technology, Substitution, and Productivity in the Interstate Natural Gas Transmission Industry under the NGPA of 1978," by Robin C. Sickles and Mary L. Streitwieser, 8/92.
- 92-8** "Analytic Use of Economic Microdata: A Model for Researcher Access with Confidentiality Protection," by Robert H. McGuckin, 8/92. Proceedings, International Seminar on Statistical Confidentiality, 1992.
- 92-7** "The Characteristics of Business Owners Database," by Alfred Nucci, 8/92.
- 92-6** "On the Turnover of Business Firms and Business Managers," by Thomas J. Holmes and James A. Schmitz, Jr., 7/92.
- 92-5** "Costs, Demand, and Imperfect Competition as Determinants of Plant-Level Output Prices," by Timothy Dunne and Mark J. Roberts, 6/92. Empirical Studies in Industrial Organization: Essays in Honor of Leonard W. Weiss pp. 13-24, (1992). B.B. Audretsch and J.J. Siegfried, eds., Clover Publishers.

- 92-4 "Estimating Capital Efficiency Schedules Within Production Functions," by Mark E. Doms, 5/92. Economic Inquiry.
- 92-3 "Price Dispersion in U.S. Manufacturing: Implications for the Aggregation of Products and Firms," by Thomas A. Abbott, III, 3/92.
- 92-2 "The Dynamics of Productivity in the Telecommunications Equipment Industry," by G. Steven Olley and Ariel Pakes, 2/92. (56 pages)
- 92-1 "Productivity Dynamics: U.S. Manufacturing Plants, 1972-1986," by Eric J. Bartelsman and Phoebus J. Dhrymes, 2/92.
- 91-10 "The Influence of Location on Productivity: Manufacturing Technology in Rural and Urban Areas," by Sheila A. Martin, Richard McHugh, and Stanley R. Johnson, 12/91.
- 91-9 "Commercial Bank Lending Practices and the Development of Black-Owned Construction Companies," by Caren Grown and Timothy Bates, 12/91. Journal of Urban Affairs, (1992), pp. 25-41.
- 91-8 "Multiple Classification Systems for Economic Data: Can a Thousand Flowers Bloom? And Should They?" by Robert H. McGuckin, 12/91. Proceedings of the 1991 Conference on the Classification of Economic Activity, 1991.
- 91-7 "Technology Usage in U.S. Manufacturing Industries: New Evidence from the Survey of Manufacturing Technology," by Timothy Dunne, 11/91. RAND Journal of Economics, Volume 25, Number 3 (Autumn 1994), pp. 488-499.
- 91-6 "Technical Inefficiency and Productive Decline in the U.S. Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Industry Under the Natural Gas Policy Act," by Robin C. Sickles and Mary L. Streitwieser, 10/91. Journal of Productivity Analysis, Volume 3, pp. 119-133, June 1992.
- 91-5 "The Structure of Production Technology, Productivity and Aggregation Effects," by Phoebus J. Dhrymes, 8/91. Proceedings, 1990 Annual Research Conference, as "The Structure of Production Technology: Evidence from the LED Sample 1."
- 91-4 "Decomposing Technical Change," by Michael Gort, Byong-Hyong Bahk, and Richard A. Wall, 5/91. Southern Economic Journal, Volume 60, Number 1, pp. 220-235.
- 91-3 "Measuring Total Factor Productivity, Technical Change and the Rate of Returns to Research and Development," by Sang V. Nguyen and Edward C. Kokkelenberg, 5/91. Journal of Productivity Analysis, Number 2, pp. 269-282, (1992).
- 91-2 "R&D Reactions to High-Technology Import Competition," by F.M. Scherer and Keun Huh, 3/91. Review of Economics and Statistics.

- 91-1 "Published Versus Sample Statistics from the ASM: Implications for the LRD," by Steven J. Davis, John Haltiwanger and Scott Schuh, 1/91. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association Business and Economics Section, (1990).
- 90-13 "The Determinants of U.S. Intra-Industry Trade," by F.M. Scherer and Keun Huh, 12/90. International High-Technology Competition, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (1992).
- 90-12 "The Relationships Among Acquiring and Acquired Firms' Product Lines," by Robert H. McGuckin, Sang V. Nguyen and Stephen H. Andrews, 9/90. Journal of Law and Economics, Part 2, pp. 477-502 (October 1991).
- 90-11 "Returns to Scale in Small and Large U.S. Manufacturing Establishments," by Sang V. Nguyen and Arnold P. Reznick, 9/90. Small Business Economics, Number 3, pp. 197-214, (1991).
- 90-10 "Gross Job Creation and Destruction: Microeconomic Evidence and Macroeconomic Implications," by Steven J. Davis and John Haltiwanger, 9/90. NBER Macroeconomics Annual, MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, (1990).
- 90-9 "Self-Employment Trends Among Mexican Americans," by Timothy Bates, 8/90. Quarterly Review of Economics and Business, (1990).
- 90-8 "The Extent and Nature of Establishment Level Diversification in Sixteen U.S. Manufacturing Industries," by Mary L. Streitwieser, 8/90. Journal of Law and Economics, Part 2, pp. 503-534 (1991).
- 90-7 "The Classification of Manufacturing Industries: An Input-Based Clustering of Activity," by Thomas A. Abbott, III and Stephen H. Andrews, 8/90. Proceedings, Census Bureau Annual Research Conference, pp. 26-45, (1990).
- 90-6 "Wages and the Risk of Plant Closings," by Timothy Dunne and Mark J. Roberts, 7/90. American Statistical Association Proceedings of the Business and Economics Statistics Section, pp. 275-280, (1989).
- 90-5 "Estimating a Multivariate Arma Model with Mixed-Frequency Data: An Application to Forecasting U.S. GNP at Monthly Intervals," by Peter A. Zadrozny, 6/90.
- 90-4 "Gross Job Creation, Gross Job Destruction, and Employment Reallocation," by Steven J. Davis and John Haltiwanger, 2/90. Quarterly Journal of Economics. (1992), Number 107, pp. 819-864
- 90-3 "Export Performance and State Industrial Growth," by Rodney A. Erickson, 1/90. Economic Geography, Volume 65, Number 4, pp. 280-292, (October 1989).

- 90-2 "An Analysis of Small Business Size and Rate of Discontinuance," by Timothy Bates and Alfred Nucci, 1/90. Journal of Small Business Management, pp. 1-7, (1990).
- 90-1 "Longitudinal Economic Data at the Census Bureau: A New Database Yields Fresh Insights on Some Old Issues," by Robert H. McGuckin, 1/90. Proceedings of the Statistics Canada Symposium on Analysis of Data in Time, pp. 243-253, (1990).
- 89-9 "The Characteristics of Business Owners (CBO) Database," by Alfred Nucci, 10/89.
- 89-8 "Multifactor Productivity and Sources of Growth in Chinese Industry: 1980-1985," by Robert H. McGuckin, Sang V. Nguyen, Jeffrey R. Taylor, and Charles A. Waite, 10/89. Presented at the winter meetings of the American Statistical Association, 1/90. An Industrial Census of China, Xu Gang, ed., Beijing, People's Republic of China: The Secretariat of the International Seminar of Analysis on China's 1985 Industrial Census Results, pp. 113-138, (1990).
- 89-7 "Price Dispersion in U.S. Manufacturing," by Thomas A. Abbott, III, 10/89. Journal of Productivity Analysis (1992) as "Producer Price Dispersion, Real Output, and the Analysis of Production."
- 89-6 "Firm Entry and Post-Entry Performance in the U.S. Chemical Industries," by Timothy Dunne, Mark J. Roberts, and Larry Samuelson, 7/89. Journal of Law and Economics, (1989).
- 89-5 "The Effects of Leveraged Buyouts on Productivity and Related Aspects of Firm Behavior," by Frank R. Lichtenberg and Donald Siegel, 7/89. Presented at the Conference on Innovation in Corporate Organization, Control, and Incentives, 1990. #3022, NBER Working Paper Series. Journal of Finance and Economics, Volume 27, pp. 165-194, (1990).
- 89-4 "Entrepreneur Factor Inputs and Small Business Longevity," by Timothy Bates, 6/89. Review of Economics and Statistics under the title "Entrepreneur Human Capital Inputs and Small Business Longevity," Volume LXII, Number IV, (1990).
- 89-3 "The Effect of Takeovers on The Employment and Wages of Central Office and Other Personnel," by Frank R. Lichtenberg and Donald Siegel, 6/89. Journal of Law and Economics, Volume 33, pp. 383-408, (1990).
- 89-2 "Using Linked Census R&D-LRD Data to Analyze the Effect of R&D Investment on Total Factor Productivity Growth," by Frank R. Lichtenberg and Donald Siegel, 1/89. Economic Inquiry under title "The Impact of R&D Investment on Productivity - New Evidence Using Linked R&D-LRD Data," Volume 29, pp. 2-13, (1990).
- 89-1 "Measuring the Trade Balance in Advanced Technology Products," by Thomas A. Abbott, III, Robert H. McGuckin, Paul Herrick, and Leroy Norfolk, 1/89. Proceedings, 1989 American Statistical Association.

- 88-5 "Analytic Derivatives For Estimation of Linear Dynamic Models," by Peter A. Zadrozny, 11/88. Journal of Computers and Mathematics with Applications, Volume 18, pp. 539-553, (1989).
- 88-4 "Modeling Technical Progress and Total Factor Productivity: A Plant-Level Example," by Edward C. Kokkelenberg & Sang V. Nguyen, 10/88. Journal of Productivity Analysis, Volume 1, Number 1, pp. 69-90, (1989).
- 88-3 "Public Use Microdata: Disclosure and Usefulness," by Robert H. McGuckin & Sang V. Nguyen, 9/88. Journal of Economic and Social Measurement, Volume 16, Number 1, pp. 19-40, (1990).
- 88-2 "The Longitudinal Research Database (LRD): Status and Research Possibilities," by Robert H. McGuckin & George A. Pascoe, Jr., 7/88. Survey of Current Business, Volume 68, Number 11, pp. 30-37 (1988).
- 88-1 "Long-Run Expectations and Capacity," by Robert H. McGuckin & Peter A. Zadrozny, 4/88. Forthcoming in Proceedings, Conference on Capacity Utilization, (1988).

Yes, I'd like to subscribe to the following:

53